

OFFICIAL FILE

I.C.C. DOCKET NO. 00-629-14 ^{OK}

Staff Exhibit No. 3

Witness _____

Date 11-2-00 Reporter (a)

**STATE OF ILLINOIS
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION**

ILLINOIS BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY (Ameritech Illinois))	
and DSLnet COMMUNICATIONS, LLC. (DSLnet))	
)	
)	00-0629
Approval of the Fourth Amendment to)	
Interconnection Agreement dated July 31, 2000,)	
pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252)	

VERIFIED STATEMENT OF A. OLUSANJO OMONIYI

My name is A. Olusanjo Omoniyi and I am employed by the Illinois Commerce Commission as a Policy Analyst in the Telecommunications Division. I graduated from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Cinema & Photography and Bachelor of Science degree in Radio-Television in 1987. In 1990, I obtained a Master of Arts degree in Telecommunications and a Juris Doctor in 1994 also from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. Among my duties as a Policy Analyst is to review negotiated agreements and provide a recommendation as to their approval.

SYNOPSIS OF THE AGREEMENT

The instant agreement between ILLINOIS BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY ("AMERITECH ILLINOIS" or "Carrier") and DSLnet COMMUNICATIONS ("DSLnet" or "Requesting Carrier"), dated July 31, 2000 is the fourth amendment to the approved Interconnection Agreement between the parties in Docket 99-NA-022. This Amendment specifically modifies two parts of the underlying agreement. The two amended parts are as follows:

- 1) Addition of an Appendix on Performance Measurements; and

- 2) Addition of a Table of Contents modified on page vii to add Appendix on Performance Measurements.

This Amendment shall not modify nor extend the effective date or terms of the underlying agreement, but rather, shall be coterminous. The underlying agreement had established the financial and operational terms for: networks on mutual and reciprocal compensation; unbundled access to Ameritech's network elements, including Ameritech's operations support systems functions; physical collocation; number portability; resale; and a variety of other business relationships.

The purpose of my verified statement is to examine the agreement based on the standards enunciated in section 252(e)(2)(A) of the 1996 Act. Specifically, this section states:

- The State commission may only reject an agreement (or any portion thereof) adopted by negotiation under subsection (a) if it finds that :
- (i) the agreement (or portion thereof) discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement; or
 - (ii) the implementation of such agreement or portion is not consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

I APPROVAL UNDER SECTION 252(e)

A. DISCRIMINATION

The first issue that must be addressed by the Commission in approving or rejecting a negotiated agreement under Section 252(e)(2)(A) is whether it discriminates against a telecommunications carrier that is not a party to the agreement.

Discrimination is generally defined as giving preferential treatment. In previous dockets, Staff has taken the position that in order to determine if a negotiated agreement is discriminatory, the Commission should determine if all similarly situated

carriers are allowed to purchase the service under the same terms and conditions as provided in the agreement. I recommend that the Commission use the same approach when evaluating this negotiated agreement.

A carrier should be deemed to be a similarly situated carrier for purposes of this agreement if telecommunications traffic is exchanged between itself and AMERITECH ILLINOIS for termination on each other's networks and if it imposes costs on AMERITECH ILLINOIS that are no higher than the costs imposed by DSLnet. If a similarly situated carrier is allowed to purchase the service(s) under the same terms and conditions as provided in this contract, then this contract should not be considered discriminatory. Evaluating the term discrimination in this manner is consistent with the economic theory of discrimination. Economic theory defines discrimination as the practice of charging different prices (or the same prices) for various units of a single product when the price differences (or same prices) are not justified by cost. See, Dolan, Edwin G. and David E. Lindsey, *Microeconomics*, 6th Edition, The Dryden Press, Orlando, FL (1991) at pg. 586. Since Section 252(i) of the 1996 Act allows similarly situated carriers to enter into essentially the same contract, this agreement should not be deemed discriminatory.

B. PUBLIC INTEREST

The second issue that needs to be addressed by the Commission in approving or rejecting a negotiated agreement under Section 252(e)(2)(A) is whether it is contrary to the public interest, convenience, and necessity. I recommend that the Commission examine the agreement on the basis of economic efficiency, equity, past Commission

orders, and state and federal law to determine if the agreement is consistent with the public interest.

In previous dockets, Staff took the position that negotiated agreements should be considered economically efficient if the services are priced at or above their Long Run Service Incremental Costs ("LRSICs"). Requiring that a service be priced at or above its LRSIC ensures that the service is not being subsidized and complies with the Commission's pricing policy. All of the services in this agreement are priced at or above their respective LRSICs. Therefore, this agreement should not be considered economically inefficient. Nothing in this agreement leads me to the conclusion that the agreement is inequitable, inconsistent with past Commission Orders, or in violation of state or federal law.

II IMPLEMENTATION

In order to assure that the implementation of the AMERITECH ILLINOIS - DSLnet agreement is in the public interest, AMERITECH ILLINOIS should implement the Agreement by filing a verified statement with the Chief Clerk of the Commission, within five (5) days of approval by the Commission, that the approved Agreement is the same as the Agreement filed in this docket with the verified petition; the Chief Clerk should place the Agreement on the Commission's web site under Interconnection Agreements. Such a requirement is consistent with the Commission's Orders in previous negotiated agreement dockets and allows interested parties access to the agreement. The following sections of AMERITECH ILLINOIS tariffs should reference

the AMERITECH ILLINOIS-DSLnet Agreement: Agreements with Telecommunications Carriers (ICC No. 21 Section 19.15).

For the reasons enumerated above, I recommend that the Commission approve this agreement pursuant to Section 252(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

VERIFICATION

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS
COUNTY OF SANGAMON)


I, A. Olusanjo Omoniyi, do on oath depose and state that if called as a witness herein, I would testify to the facts contained in the foregoing document based upon personal knowledge.



SIGNED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS 31st DAY OF
October, 2000.



NOTARY PUBLIC



Service List

October 25, 2000

00-0627, 00-0628, 00-0629 ———JEW

Deborah King
Hearing Examiner
Illinois Commerce Commission
160 N. LaSalle Street, Suite C-800
Chicago, IL 60601

Sula Hobbs
Regulatory Affairs
DLSnet Communications
545 Long Wharf Drive, FL. 5
new Haven, CT 06511

Mary Beth Jorgensen
Illinois Bell Telephone
225 W. Randolph, HQ27C
Chicago, IL 60606

James E. Weging
Office of General Counsel
Illinois Commerce Commission
160 N. LaSalle Street, Ste. C-800
Chicago, IL 60601

Mark Kerber
Illinois Bell Telephone Company
225 W. Randolph Street
Chicago, IL 60601

Donna Caton
Chief Clerk
Illinois Commerce Commission
527 E. Capitol Avenue
Springfield, IL 62701